Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE APPLICATION OF OLEGS FILS. Petitioner.

Case No. 20-mc-80176-EMC

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR DE **NOVO DETERMINATION OF** DISPOSITIVE MATTER

Docket No. 8

On October 2, 2020, Petitioner Olegs Fils filed an ex parte application for leave under 28 U.S.C. § 1782 to seek discovery from several third-party merchants in this district for use in a civil proceeding in Latvia, where Mr. Fils is the claimant (the "Latvia Action"). See Docket No. 2 ("Ex Parte App."). On October 14, 2020, Magistrate Judge Nathanael Cousin issued a report and recommendation recommending that this Court deny Mr. Fils's ex parte application. See Docket No. 6 ("Report"). Shortly thereafter, Mr. Fils filed the pending motion for de novo determination of his ex parte application, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)(2), and Civil Local Rules 7-2 and 72-3. See Docket No. 8 ("Mot.").

Judge Cousins first correctly determined that Mr. Fils's application satisfied § 1782's statutory requirements because (1) the Merchants are located in this district, (2) the discovery Mr. Fils seeks is for use in a foreign legal proceeding, and (3) Mr. Fils is an interested person in the Latvia Action because he is the claimant. See Report at 2. Judge Cousins then concluded that Mr.

Specifically, Fils applies for the issuance of subpoenas to: (1) Specialized Helicopters, Inc.; (2) the Hyatt Corporation; (3) the Hyatt Carmel Highlands (also known as Highlands Inn, Inc.); (4) Burst + Bloom; (5) SommPicks, LLC; (6) Benchmark Wine Group, Inc.; and (7) Belmont Wine Exchange, LLC (collectively, the "Merchants"). See Ex Parte App. at 1.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Fils's application satisfies three out of the four factors the Supreme Court identified in *Intel Corp*. v. Advanced Micro Devices, Inc., 542 U.S. 241, 264 (2004), for determining if discovery sought in a foreign proceeding is appropriate: (1) the evidence sought from the Merchants is not obviously within the Latvian court's jurisdictional reach; (2) there is no indication that the Latvian court would not be receptive to discovery assistance by a United States court; and (3) the request does not conceal an attempt to circumvent foreign proof-gathering restrictions or other policies of a foreign country or the United States. See Report at 2–3.

Judge Cousins concluded, however, that the fourth *Intel* factor—whether the discovery sought is unduly intrusive or burdensome—was not satisfied because "the proposed subpoenas are grossly overbroad and [Mr.] Fils and his counsel have not taken reasonable steps to avoid imposing undue burden and expense on the [Merchants]." Report at 3. Presumably to address this problem, Mr. Fils also filed with this Court an administrative motion to augment the record pursuant to Civil Local Rules 7-11 and 72-3(b) to included proposed revised versions of the seven subpoenas that Judge Cousins determined were grossly overbroad and burdensome. See Docket Nos. 9 ("Admin. Mot.") at 1; & 9-1 (Decl. of Joseph R. Ashby), Exs. 18–24. Therefore, the only question before this Court is whether the proposed revised subpoenas are sufficiently narrow to satisfy the fourth Intel factor.

Having reviewed the changes Mr. Fils made to the proposed revised subpoenas, the Court concludes that those revised subpoenas are sufficiently narrow to satisfy the fourth *Intel* factor. Accordingly, Mr. Fils's motion for de novo determination and administrative motion to augment the record are **GRANTED**. Mr. Fils's ex parte application for the issuance of the revised subpoenas is also **GRANTED**. The Court notes, however, that nothing in this order precludes the ///

///

///

/// 26

27 ///

28 ///

Case 5:20-mc-80176-EMC Document 11 Filed 01/11/21 Page 3 of 3

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
	10
	11
ia	12
liforn	13
District of Cali	14
	15
	16
thern	17
Nor	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24
	25
	26

27

28

United States District Court

recipients of those subpoenas from moving to quash or modify any of the revised subpoenas
pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 45(d)(3).

This order disposes of Docket Nos. 1, 6, 8, and 9.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 11, 2021

EDWARD M. CHEN United States District Judge